

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-19 are pending in the present application. Claims 7 and 20 were previously cancelled. Claims 1-6 and 8-19 stand rejected.

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Memmott et al. (US Patent No. 6,560,591).

Applicants have amended the claim in order to clarify the distinction but otherwise respectfully disagree for the reasons stated below.

With respect to independent claim 1, the examiner maintains that Memmott disclose:

preparing a query specifying the constraints to be applied on at least two data structure wherein each data structure is stored in a different data format (col. 3, lines 26-41, a query be formatted in object-oriented formats such as Managed object format and syntaxes such as XML, wherein the query may conform to at least one among the distributed management schemes. In the query is a query characteristic that identifies the information requested and/or the subject matter of the query, for example, a query relating to a DVD);

Action p. 3. The cited portion of Memmott misses the point of the claim and does not meet the claimed limitation. The claim does not require the query to be of different format types as is suggested in the cited passage from Memmott; rather, the claim requires the data structures to be of different formats. The cited portion of Memmott by contrast clearly says that the *query may be formatted* in different object-oriented formats. As such Memmott does not anticipate independent claim 1.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to further clarify the distinction over Memmott. For example, claim 1, as amended, recites: “each data structure is stored in a different data format type.” See support, for example, in Figures 5A-5C and accompanying text.

Inasmuch as claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, they also patentably define over Memmott.

Claim 8 has also been further amended to clarify the above distinction over Memmott and for at least that reason also patentably defines over Memmott. Inasmuch as claims 9-12 depend from claim 8, they also patentably define over Memmott for at least the same reasons as independent claim 8.

The examiner has also rejected claim 13 on the basis that Memmott discloses:

indicating in a response to the query whether the query data type matches the data structure data type and whether the query value matched the value stored in the data structure (col. 6, lines 20-24, once data responsive to the query has been obtained, a response based on the data is transmitted to the data requestor).

Action p. 5. Applicants respectfully disagree. The claim clearly requires two items of information be indicated in response to the query: (1) whether the data type matches the data structure data type and (2) whether the query value matches the value stored in the data structure. The cited portion of Memmott merely says that data responsive to the request is transmitted to the requestor. However, Memmott nowhere describes how the data type math information is returned.

For at least that reason, claim 13 patentably defines over Memmott. Inasmuch as claims 14-19 depend from claim 13, they also patentably define over Memmott for at least the same reason.

CONCLUSION

In the view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative.

Date: December 28, 2007

/Michael J. Swope/
Michael J. Swope
Registration No. 38,041

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439